



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

list. Its securing for the Yale museum is a master-stroke of Clay's business ability, and its publication is worthy of its quality. According to my chronological calculations these kings ruled approximately in the period 2364–2099 B. C. Clay, of course, raises, in his discussion, the burning question concerning Arioch (Gen. xiv. 1) whom many of us have identified with Arad-Sin, Clay himself having been of the number. The new list however shows that Aradsin was not a contemporary of Hammurapi, who seems quite certainly to have been the Amraphel of Genesis. Clay, therefore, determined to uphold the chronological as well as the historical character of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, now abandons the equation Arad-Sin = Arioch, though admitting still that it has a sound philological basis, and returns to Sayce's equation Rim-Sin = Arioch. I find it quite impossible to follow him in this, being unwilling to depart from an equation founded on sound philological principles merely to sustain the Genesis passage and being rather willing either to wait some other explanation not yet brought forward, or frankly to accept the explication of the passage as containing a legendary mistake. However this dispute may issue, I recommend to historical students to study in Clay's excellent introduction, well supplied with adequate translations, these valuable collections of tablets now published for the first time.

ROBERT W. ROGERS.

Archaeology and the Bible. By GEORGE A. BARTON, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Semitic Languages in Bryn Mawr College. (Philadelphia: American Sunday-School Union. 1916. Pp. xiii, 461, 114 plates.)

In this volume Professor Barton has aimed to gather all the facts bearing upon the interpretation of both Old and New Testament that have been discovered by archaeology during the last century. He has done his work thoroughly. Scientific journals and reports of excavators have been ransacked with painstaking completeness, and the result is that the student is here presented with the most complete manual on the subject that exists in any language. The author is an accomplished Semitic philologist, so that all translations of inscriptions are made from the originals and represent the most advanced stage of modern linguistic science. He is also an historical critic of sober judgment and long training, so that he knows how to use his materials with discretion. In this work he has avoided the common vice of writing in an apologetic vein, and seeking to find in every discovery of archaeology a "confirmation" of the Bible; and also the no less dangerous vice of the modern German "Pan-Babylonian" school, of building fantastic theories on unsubstantial archaeological foundations, and of endeavoring with these to undermine the general historical character of the Bible.

The method of treating the subject is a combination of the topical and the historical. The nations of the ancient Orient, Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria, the Hittites, and Palestine, are taken up successively, and under each head the following topics are considered: the land, the preservation of antiquities, the discovery of antiquities, the decipherment of the inscriptions, chronology, outline of the history, and discoveries which bear on the Bible. The translations of texts are all given together in the second part. This method has the advantage of allowing an easy classification of facts whose chronological determination is difficult, it also makes it possible to avoid the historical fixing of some of the Biblical traditions, and so to escape theological and critical controversy—an obvious desideratum in a book published by the Sunday-School Union and designed for the use of Sunday-School teachers and scholars.

For the student of history, however, this method has grave disadvantages. If one wishes to know what was happening in the ancient world in any given period of its history, one must go for the documents to the second part, and for the archaeological facts to every one of the preceding chapters. For instance, suppose that one wishes to know about the age of Abram. On page 294 one finds that Hammurapi may be the same as Amraphel of Genesis xiv., the contemporary of Abram. For the reign of Hammurapi one is compelled to go to chapter II. on Babylonia, where one learns on page 47 of the discovery of the Code of Hammurapi, and to page 53, where the reign of Hammurapi is described. The Code of Hammurapi is not given until chapter XIII. of part II. The contemporary history of the Twelfth Dynasty in Egypt is given in the first chapter, page 27 f., and the contemporary history of Palestine in chapter V., page 108. The story of Sinuhe, which belongs to this period, is not given until chapter XI. of part II. This method is most inconvenient for historical purposes. The histories of the ancient Oriental peoples interlock closely, and we want to know what was happening to all of them in any given period. A much more convenient method of treating the facts would be to divide the history into as brief periods as possible, *e. g.*, the Sumerian, the Akkadian, the Amorite, the Hittite-Hyksos, the Egyptian, etc., and under each of these periods to group in chronological order all the documents and all the facts archaeological and biblical. The lack of this method makes this work a source-book for historians rather than a history.

LEWIS BAYLES PATON.